

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
AIKEN DIVISION

Timothy M. Hopper	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	C.A. No. 1:09-cv-02434-JMC
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
	)	
Michael J. Astrue,	)	
Commissioner of Social Security	)	
Administration,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

Plaintiff filed the complaint in this action, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and § 1383(c)(3), seeking judicial review of the final decision of the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration (“Commissioner”) denying his claims for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income.

The Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation [Doc.# 24], filed on January 7, 2011, recommends that the decision of the Commissioner be reversed and remanded under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. §405(g) for additional consideration. The Report and Recommendation sets forth in detail the relevant facts and legal standards on this matter, and the court incorporates the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation herein without a recitation.

The Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objections are made, and the court

may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the Magistrate Judge's recommendation or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The parties were advised of their right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation [Doc. # 24-1]. However, neither party filed an objection to the Report and Recommendation.

In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note). Furthermore, failure to file specific written objections to the Report and Recommendation results in a party's waiver of the right to appeal from the judgment of the District Court based upon such recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).

After a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation [Doc. # 24]. Therefore, the Commissioner's decision is **REVERSED**, and this case is remanded to the Commissioner for additional consideration consistent with the Magistrate Judge's recommendation.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/J. Michelle Childs  
United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina  
February 3, 2011